

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed July 10, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendments and following remarks are made in response thereto. Claims 1–20 are canceled without prejudice to the underlying subject matter and claims 21–50 are added. Support for claims 21–50 may be found within the Specification, e.g., Pages 11 to 16 (Paragraphs 047 to 058) and FIG. 5; Pages 6 to 10 (Paragraphs 024 to 042) and FIGS. 1–3; etc. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 21–50 are pending.

Claims 1–4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13–17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,549 to Schneider ("Schneider"). Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,903 to Baxter et al. ("Baxter").

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicants submit that pending claims 21–50 are allowable over the cited art.

**New Claims 21–50 Are Patentable Over the Cited References**

Claim 21 is directed to a method for maintaining a whois database and recites, in pertinent part, "extracting a plurality of unique identifiers from an audit file, each unique identifier corresponding to a modified domain name record within a registrar database." Claim 21 also recites, in pertinent part, "for each unique identifier: determining whether a first corresponding domain name record exists within the registrar database, if the first corresponding domain name record exists, retrieving the first corresponding domain name record from the registrar database, determining whether a second corresponding domain name record exists within the whois database, if the second corresponding domain name record exists, retrieving the second corresponding domain name record from the whois database, comparing the first corresponding domain name record to the second corresponding domain name record, and updating the second corresponding domain name record based on the first corresponding domain name record." Claims 31 and 41, directed to a computer-readable medium and a system, respectively, recite similar subject matter. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references disclose these features.

Schneider is directed to a reusable information processing system and discloses that provider 94 sends first data 120 to subscriber 96 using portable storage media 136, and then

sends subsequent data 122, including control data 126, to subscriber 96 electronically. Subscriber 96 then executes program 34 on computer system 32 to combine control data 126 with current data 142 to create "an indexed database of newly available information 130" (Col. 21, lines 3–7; Col. 22, lines 15–18). As noted by the Examiner (Office Action at Page 4, Paragraph 6), when subscriber 96 initiates an update, subscriber 96 has the option of sending additional information, such as "subscriber log files that track index history ... for the purpose of synchronization" (Col. 22, lines 6–13). *See, generally*, Abstract; Col. 8 lines 40–47; Col. 17, line 10 to Col. 18, line 57 and FIG. 4a; etc. However, while Schneider discloses that "another field of application pertains to the availability of domain names" (Col. 26, lines 60–61), Schneider fails to teach or suggest that a plurality of unique identifiers, each corresponding to a modified domain name record within a registrar database, may be extracted from an audit file, as recited by claims 21, 31 and 41.

Furthermore, Schneider is entirely silent on whether these unique identifiers may be used to maintain a whois database. Schneider fails to disclose whether the unique identifier may be used to determine whether a first corresponding domain name record exists within the registrar database, or whether a second corresponding domain name record exists within the whois database, as recited by claims 21, 31 and 41. Schneider also fails to teach or suggest that the first and second corresponding domain name records may then be retrieved from the registrar and whois databases, respectively, and compared, as recited by claims 21, 31 and 41. Moreover, Schneider fails to disclose that the second corresponding domain name record may be updated based on the first corresponding domain name record, as recited by claims 21, 31 and 41. The Applicants also submit that Baxter fails to provide this missing subject matter.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21, 31 and 41 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 22–30, depending from claim 21, claims 32–40, depending from claim 31, and claims 42–50, depending from claim 41, are also allowable, at least for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending § 102 and § 103 rejections.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present case is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect would be greatly appreciated.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4294 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

October 10, 2003

  
Adam M. Treiber (Reg. No. 48,000)

1500 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 220-4200 (phone)  
(202) 220-4201 (fax)

DC:462293\_1.DOC